arXiv:1606.06207v3 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 4 Nov 2016

Non-local meta-conformal invariance in diffusion-limited erosion

Malte Henkel[a,b]

[a]Rechnergestützte Physik der Werkstoffe, Institut für Baustoffe (IfB),
ETH Zürich, Stefano-Franscini-Platz 3, CH - 8093 Zürich, Switzerland
[b]Groupe de Physique Statistique, Département de Physique de la Matière et des Matériaux,
Institut Jean Lamour (CNRS UMR 7198), Université de Lorraine Nancy,
B.P. 70239, F – 54506 Vandœuvre lès Nancy Cedex, France[1]

Abstract

The non-stationary relaxation and physical ageing in the diffusion-limited erosion process (DLE) is studied through the exact solution of its Langevin equation, in d spatial dimensions. The dynamical exponent $z = 1$, the growth exponent $\beta = \max(0, (1-d)/2)$ and the ageing exponents $a = b = d - 1$ and $\lambda_C = \lambda_R = d$ are found. In $d = 1$ spatial dimension, a new representation of the meta-conformal Lie algebra, isomorphic to $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R}) \oplus \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$, acts as a dynamical symmetry of the noise-averaged DLE Langevin equation. Its infinitesimal generators are non-local in space. The exact form of the full time-space dependence of the two-time response function of DLE is reproduced for $d = 1$ from this symmetry. The relationship to the terrace-step-kink model of vicinal surfaces is discussed.

Keywords: diffusion-limited erosion, laplacian growth, physical ageing, conformal invariance, local scale-invariance, non-locality, terrace-step-kink model
PACS numbers: 05.40.Fb, 05.10.Gg, 81.10.Aj, 11.25.Hf

[1]permanent address

1. The physics of the growth of interfaces is a paradigmatic example of the emergence of non-equilibrium phenomena cooperative phenomena [2, 28, 8, 41, 15]. The most common universality classes, such as the Edwards-Wilkinson (EW) [11], Kardar-Parisi-Zhang (KPZ) [24], Wolf-Villain (WV) [45] or Arcetri [21] classes, are usually specified in terms of models describing the deposition of particles on a surface, leading to the formation of a fluctuating height profile $h(t, \boldsymbol{r})$ of the interface. The cooperative nature of the phenomenon is expressed in the long-time Family-Viscek scaling behaviour [12] of the interface width

$$w^2(t;L) := \frac{1}{L^d} \sum_{\boldsymbol{r} \in \mathscr{L}} \left\langle \left(h(t,\boldsymbol{r}) - \overline{h}(t) \right) \right\rangle^2 = L^{2\alpha} f_w\left(tL^{-z}\right) \sim \left\{ \begin{array}{lll} t^{2\beta} & ; & \text{if } tL^{-z} \ll 1 \\ L^{2\alpha} & ; & \text{if } tL^{-z} \gg 1 \end{array} \right. \tag{1}$$

on a hyper-cubic lattice $\mathscr{L} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ of $|\mathscr{L}| = L^d$ sites, where $\langle . \rangle$ denotes an average over many independent samples and $\overline{h}(t) := L^{-d} \sum_{\boldsymbol{r} \in \mathscr{L}} h(t, \boldsymbol{r})$ is the spatially averaged height. Herein, α is the *roughness exponent*, β the *growth exponent* and $z = \alpha/\beta > 0$ the *dynamical exponent*. The interface is called *rough* if $\beta > 0$ and *smooth* if $\lim_{t\to\infty} w(t)$ is finite. While theoretical studies abound, reliable experimental results are quite recent. Examples for the KPZ class include turbulent liquid crystals, cell colony growth, colloïds, paper combustion, auto-catalytic reaction fronts, thin semiconductor films and sedimentation-electrodispersion, see [43, 15] for recent reviews and [21] for a list of measured values of these exponents. More subtle aspects can be studied through the non-equilibrium relaxation, analogous to physical ageing e.g. in glasses or simple magnets [18]. Analysis proceeds via the two-time correlator $C(t, s; \boldsymbol{r})$ and the two-time response $R(t, s; \boldsymbol{r})$. For sufficiently large lattices (where effectively $L \to \infty$) one expects, in the long-time scaling limit $t, s \to \infty$ with $y := t/s > 1$ fixed, the scaling behaviour

$$C(t,s;\boldsymbol{r}) := \left\langle \left(h(t,\boldsymbol{r}) - \left\langle \overline{h}(t) \right\rangle \right) \left(h(s,\boldsymbol{0}) - \left\langle \overline{h}(s) \right\rangle \right) \right\rangle = s^{-b} F_C\left(\frac{t}{s}; \frac{\boldsymbol{r}}{s^{1/z}} \right) \tag{2}$$

$$R(t,s;\boldsymbol{r}) := \left. \frac{\delta \left\langle h(t,\boldsymbol{r}) - \overline{h}(t) \right\rangle}{\delta j(s,\boldsymbol{0})} \right|_{j=0} = \left\langle h(t,\boldsymbol{r}) \widetilde{h}(s,\boldsymbol{0}) \right\rangle = s^{-1-a} F_R\left(\frac{t}{s}; \frac{\boldsymbol{r}}{s^{1/z}} \right) \tag{3}$$

where spatial translation-invariance has been implicitly admitted and j is an external field conjugate[1] to h. The *autocorrelation exponent* λ_C and the *autoresponse exponent* λ_R are defined from the asymptotics $F_{C,R}(y, \boldsymbol{0}) \sim y^{-\lambda_{C,R}/z}$ as $y \to \infty$. For these non-equilibrium exponents, one has $b = -2\beta$ and the bound $\lambda_C \geq (d + zb)/2$. For the EW, KPZ, WV and Arcetri classes, where the dynamical exponent $z \geq \frac{3}{2}$, the values of $a, b, \lambda_C, \lambda_R$ have been determined either analytically or in simulations [29, 36, 10, 7, 9, 20, 14, 32, 21] or else experimentally [42].

Here, we shall be interested in a different universality class, namely *diffusion-limited erosion* (DLE) [26], often also referred to as *Laplacian growth*. We shall first derive the width $w(t)$, the correlator $C(t, s; \boldsymbol{r})$ and the response $R(t, s; \boldsymbol{r})$ from the exact solution of the defining Langevin equation. Then, for $d = 1$ spatial dimension, we shall construct a new representation of the conformal Lie algebra, in terms of *spatially non-local operators*. We shall show that (i) this representation acts as a dynamical symmetry of the equation of motion of DLE and (ii) that for $d = 1$, this dynamical symmetry (which has $z = 1$), predicts the form of the response $R(t, s; \boldsymbol{r})$.

2. The DLE *process* [26] can be defined as a lattice model by considering the diffusive motion of a corrosive particle, which starts initially far away from the interface. When the particle finally reaches the interface, it erodes a particle from that interface. Repeating this process

[1] In the context of Janssen-de Dominicis theory, $\widetilde{h}$ is the conjugate response field to h, see [41].

many times, an eroding interface forms which is described in terms of a fluctuating height $h(t, \boldsymbol{r})$. This leads to the Langevin equation for $h(t, \boldsymbol{r})$ in DLE. In Fourier space [26, 27]

$$\partial_t \widehat{h}(t, \boldsymbol{q}) = -\nu |\boldsymbol{q}| \widehat{h}(t, \boldsymbol{q}) + \widehat{\jmath}(t, \boldsymbol{q}) + \widehat{\eta}(t, \boldsymbol{q}) \tag{4}$$

including the gaussian white noise[2] $\widehat{\eta}$, with the variance $\langle \widehat{\eta}(t, \boldsymbol{q}) \widehat{\eta}(t', \boldsymbol{q}') \rangle = 2\nu T \delta(t - t') \delta(\boldsymbol{q} + \boldsymbol{q}')$ and the constants ν, T and an external perturbation $\widehat{\jmath}$. Several lattice formulations of the model exist [26, 44, 1, 46]. Flat and radial geometries are compared in [16]. Potential applications of DLE may include contact lines of a liquid meniscus and crack propagation [30]. Remarkably, for $d = 1$ space dimension, the Langevin equation (4) has been argued [38] to be related to a system of non-interacting fermions, conditioned to an a-typically large flux. Consider the *terrace-step-kink model* of a vicinal surface, and interpret the steps as the world lines of fermions. Its transfer matrix is the matrix exponential of the quantum hamiltonian H of the asymmetric XXZ chain [38]. Use Pauli matrices $\sigma_n^{\pm,z}$, attached to each site n, such that the particle number at each site is $\varrho_n = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \sigma_n^z) = 0, 1$. On a chain of N sites [38, 35, 25]

$$H = -\frac{w}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left[2v \sigma_n^+ \sigma_{n+1}^- + 2v^{-1} \sigma_n^- \sigma_{n+1}^+ + \Delta \left(\sigma_n^z \sigma_{n+1}^z - 1 \right) \right] \tag{5}$$

where $w = \sqrt{pq}\, e^{\mu}$, $v = \sqrt{p/q}\, e^{\lambda}$ and $\Delta = 2 \left(\sqrt{p/q} + \sqrt{q/p} \right) e^{-\mu}$. Herein, p, q describe the left/right bias of single-particle hopping and λ, μ are the grand-canonical parameters conjugate to the current and the mean particle number. In the continuum limit, the particle density $\varrho_n(t) \to \varrho(t, r) = \partial_r h(t, r)$ is related to the height h which in turn obeys (4), with a *gaussian white noise* η [38]. This follows from the application of the theory of fluctuating hydrodynamics, see [39, 6] for recent reviews. The low-energy behaviour of H yields the dynamical exponent $z = 1$ [38, 35, 25]. [3] If one conditions the system to an a-typically large current, the large-time, large-distance behaviour of (5) has very recently been shown [25] (i) to be described by a conformal field-theory with central charge $c = 1$ and (ii) the time-space scaling behaviour of the stationary structure function has been worked out explicitly, for $\lambda \to \infty$. Therefore, one may conjecture that the so simple-looking eq. (4) should furnish an effective continuum description of the large-time, long-range properties of quite non-trivial systems, such as (5).

The solution of (4) reads in momentum space

$$\widehat{h}(t, \boldsymbol{q}) = e^{-\nu |\boldsymbol{q}| t}\, \widehat{h}(0, \boldsymbol{q}) + \int_0^t \mathrm{d}\tau\, e^{-\nu |\boldsymbol{q}| (t - \tau)} \left(\widehat{\jmath}(\tau, \boldsymbol{q}) + \widehat{\eta}(\tau, \boldsymbol{q}) \right) \tag{6}$$

In this letter, we focus on the non-equilibrium relaxation of DLE, starting from an an initially flat interface $h(0, \boldsymbol{r}) = 0$. If $\widehat{\jmath}(t, \boldsymbol{q}) = 0$, the average interface position remains fixed, thus $\langle \widehat{h}(t, \boldsymbol{q}) \rangle = 0$ and $\langle h(t, \boldsymbol{r}) \rangle = 0$. The two-time correlator and response are

$$\widehat{C}(t, s; \boldsymbol{q}, \boldsymbol{q}') := \left\langle \widehat{h}(t, \boldsymbol{q}) \widehat{h}(s, \boldsymbol{q}') \right\rangle = \frac{T}{|\boldsymbol{q}|} \left[e^{-\nu |\boldsymbol{q}| |t - s|} - e^{-\nu |\boldsymbol{q}| (t + s)} \right] \delta(\boldsymbol{q} + \boldsymbol{q}') \tag{7a}$$

$$\widehat{R}(t, s; \boldsymbol{q}, \boldsymbol{q}') := \left. \frac{\delta \langle \widehat{h}(t, \boldsymbol{q}) \rangle}{\delta \widehat{\jmath}(s, \boldsymbol{q}')} \right|_{j=0} = \Theta(t - s)\, e^{-\nu |\boldsymbol{q}| (t - s)}\, \delta(\boldsymbol{q} + \boldsymbol{q}') \tag{7b}$$

[2] Below, we shall refer to (4) with $\widehat{\eta} = 0$ as the *deterministic part* of (4).

[3] Empirically, the bubbles in the price of crude oil display dynamical scaling of the form (1) with $z \approx 1$ [13].

which becomes in direct space, with $\mathcal{C}_0 := \pi^{-(d+1)/2}\Gamma((d+1)/2)/\Gamma(d/2)$, and for $d \neq 1$

$$C(t,s;\boldsymbol{r}) = \frac{T\mathcal{C}_0}{d-1}\left[\left(\nu^2(t-s)^2+r^2\right)^{-(d-1)/2} - \left(\nu^2(t+s)^2+r^2\right)^{-(d-1)/2}\right] \tag{8a}$$

$$R(t,s;\boldsymbol{r}) = \mathcal{C}_0\,\Theta(t-s)\,\nu(t-s)\left(\nu^2(t-s)^2+r^2\right)^{-(d+1)/2} \tag{8b}$$

where the Heaviside function Θ expresses the causality condition $t > s$. In particular, the interface width $w^2(t) = C(t,t;\mathbf{0})$ is (apply a high-momentum cut-off Λ for $L \to \infty$, if $d > 1$)

$$w^2(t) = \frac{T\mathcal{C}_0}{1-d}\left[(2\nu t)^{1-d} - \mathcal{C}_1(\Lambda)\right] \overset{t\to\infty}{\simeq} \begin{cases} T\mathcal{C}_0\mathcal{C}_1(\Lambda)/(d-1) & ;\ \text{if } d>1 \\ T\mathcal{C}_0\ln(2\nu t) & ;\ \text{if } d=1 \\ \left[T\mathcal{C}_0(2\nu)^{1-d}/(1-d)\right]\cdot t^{1-d} & ;\ \text{if } d<1 \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

This shows the upper critical dimension $d^* = 1$ of DLE, such that at late times the interface is smooth for $d > 1$ and rough for $d \leq 1$ [26]. In the long-time *stationary* limit $t, s \to \infty$ with the time difference $\tau = t - s$ being kept fixed, one has the fluctuation-dissipation relationship $\partial C(s+\tau, s; \boldsymbol{r})/\partial\tau = -\nu T R(s+\tau, s; \boldsymbol{r})$. This was to be expected, since there exist lattice model versions in the DLE class which can be formulated in terms of an equilibrium system [44]. Finally, in the long-time *scaling* limit $t, s \to \infty$ with $y := t/s > 1$ being kept fixed, one may read off from (8,9) the exponents

$$\beta = \alpha = \begin{cases} 0 & ;\ \text{if } d>1 \\ (1-d)/2 & ;\ \text{if } d<1 \end{cases} \quad , \quad z = 1 \ , \ a = b = d-1 \ , \ \lambda_C = \lambda_R = d \tag{10}$$

In contrast to the interface width $w(t)$, which shows a logarithmic growth at $d = d^* = 1$, logarithms cancel in the two-time correlator C and response R, up to *additive* logarithmic corrections to scaling. This is well-established in the physical ageing of magnetic systems [18].

3. Can one explain the form of the two-time scaling functions of the DLE in terms of a dynamical symmetry ? Such an approach, based on extensions of the dynamical scaling $t \mapsto b^z t$ and $\boldsymbol{r} \mapsto b\boldsymbol{r}$ to a larger set of transformations where $b = b(t, \boldsymbol{r})$ becomes effectively time-space-dependent, has been applied and tested in the physical ageing of magnetic systems, quenched either to their critical temperature $T = T_c > 0$ or else to $T < T_c$ (where $z = 2$), see [18] for a detailed review. More recently, this was also done for the relaxation dynamics in interface growth, namely for the the EW class [36] where $z = 2$ and the $(1+1)D$ KPZ class [20], where $z = \frac{3}{2}$. These tests mainly involved the fitting of the auto-response $R(t, s; \mathbf{0})$ to the exact solutions or the numerical data. Since in the DLE class, one has $z = 1$, a different set of local time-space transformations must be sought. It might look tempting to consider conformal invariance [5], well-known from equilibrium critical phenomena, by simply relabelling one of the spatial directions as 'time', since this would give $z = 1$. However, as we shall see, a more precise definition is needed. For notational simplicity, we now restrict to the case of $1+1$ time-space dimensions, labelled by a 'time coordinate' t and a 'space coordinate' r.

Definition. *1. A set of* ortho-conformal transformations[4] *(usually called 'conformal transformation') $\mathscr{O}$ is a set of maps $(t,r) \mapsto (t',r') = \mathscr{O}(t,r)$ of local coordinate transformations, depending analytically on several parameters, such that angles in the coordinate space of the points (t,r) are kept invariant. The maximal finite-dimensional Lie sub-algebra of ortho-conformal transformations is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{conf}(2) \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R}) \oplus \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$. A physical system is* ortho-conformally invariant *if its n-point functions transform covariantly under ortho-conformal transformations. 2. A set of* meta-conformal transformations[5] *$\mathscr{M}$ is a set of maps $(t,r) \mapsto (t',r') = \mathscr{M}(t,r)$, de-*

[4]From the greek prefix *ορθο*: right, standard.

[5]From the greek prefix *μετα*: of secondary rank.

pending analytically on several parameters, whose maximal finite-dimensional Lie sub-algebra of meta-conformal transformations is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{conf}(2)$*. A physical system is* meta-conformally invariant *if its n-point functions transform covariantly under meta-conformal transformations.*

Hence, ortho-conformal transformations are also meta-conformal transformations.

In $(1+1)D$, ortho-conformal transformations are all analytic or anti-analytic maps, $z \mapsto f(z)$ or $\bar{z} \mapsto \bar{f}(\bar{z})$, of the complex variables $z = t + \mathrm{i}r$, $\bar{z} = t - \mathrm{i}r$. For our purposes, we restrict here to the projective conformal transformations $z \mapsto \frac{\alpha z+\beta}{\gamma z+\delta}$ with $\alpha\delta - \beta\gamma = 1$ and similarly for $\bar{z}$. Then the Lie algebra generators $\ell_n = -z^{n+1}\partial_z$ and $\bar{\ell}_n = -\bar{z}^{n+1}\partial_{\bar{z}}$ with $n = \pm 1, 0$ span the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{conf}(2) \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R}) \oplus \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$. We shall use below the basis[6] $X_n := \ell_n + \bar{\ell}_n$ and $Y_n := \ell_n - \bar{\ell}_n$. In an ortho-conformally invariant physical system, these generators act on physical 'quasi-primary' [5] scaling operators $\phi = \phi(z,\bar{z}) = \varphi(t,r)$ and then contain also terms which describe how these quasi-primary operators should transform, namely

$$\ell_n = -z^{n+1}\partial_z - \Delta(n+1)z^n \quad , \quad \bar{\ell}_n = -\bar{z}^{n+1}\partial_{\bar{z}} - \overline{\Delta}(n+1)\bar{z}^n \tag{11}$$

where $\Delta, \overline{\Delta}$ are the conformal weights of the scaling operator ϕ. Laplace's equation $\mathcal{S}\phi = 4\partial_z\partial_{\bar{z}}\phi = 0$ is a simple example of an ortho-conformally invariant system, since the commutator

$$[\mathcal{S}, \ell_n]\,\phi(z,\bar{z}) = -(n+1)z^n\mathcal{S}\phi(z,\bar{z}) - 4\Delta n(n+1)z^{n-1}\partial_{\bar{z}}\phi(z,\bar{z}) \tag{12}$$

shows that for a scaling operator ϕ with $\Delta = \overline{\Delta} = 0$, the space of solutions of the Laplace equation $\mathcal{S}\phi = 0$ is conformally invariant, since any solution is mapped onto another solution in the transformed coordinates.[7] A two-point function of quasi-primary scaling operators is $\mathscr{C}(t_1,t_2;r_1,r_2) := \langle\phi_1(z_1,\bar{z}_1)\phi_2(z_2,\bar{z}_2)\rangle = \langle\varphi_1(t_1,r_1)\varphi_2(t_2,r_2)\rangle$. Its covariance under ortho-conformal transformations is expressed by the 'projective Ward identities' $X_n\mathscr{C} = Y_n\mathscr{C} = 0$ for $n = \pm 1, 0$ [5]. For scalars, such that $\Delta_i = \overline{\Delta}_i = x_i$, this gives [34]

$$\mathscr{C}(t_1,t_2;r_1,r_2) = \mathcal{C}_0\,\delta_{x_1,x_2}\left((t_1-t_2)^2 + (r_1-r_2)^2\right)^{-x_1} \tag{13}$$

where $\mathcal{C}_0$ is a normalisation constant.

An example of meta-conformal transformations in $(1+1)$ dimensions is given by [17]

$$\begin{aligned} X_n &= -t^{n+1}\partial_t - \mu^{-1}[(t+\mu r)^{n+1} - t^{n+1}]\partial_r - (n+1)xt^n - (n+1)\frac{\gamma}{\mu}[(t+\mu r)^n - t^n] \\ Y_n &= -(t+\mu r)^{n+1}\partial_r - (n+1)\gamma(t+\mu r)^n \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where x, γ are the scaling dimension and the 'rapidity' of the scaling operator $\varphi = \varphi(t,r)$ on which these generators act and the constant $1/\mu$ has the dimensions of a velocity. The Lie algebra $\langle X_n, Y_n\rangle_{n=\pm1,0}$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{conf}(2)$ [22]. An invariant equation[8] is $\mathcal{S}\varphi = (-\mu\partial_t + \partial_r)\varphi = 0$, provided only that $\gamma = \mu x$, since the only non-vanishing commutators of the Lie algebra with $\mathcal{S}$ are $[\mathcal{S}, X_0]\,\varphi = -\mathcal{S}\varphi$ and $[\mathcal{S}, X_1]\,\varphi = -2t\mathcal{S}\varphi + 2(\mu x - \gamma)\varphi$. The covariant two-point function is [17, 23]

$$\mathscr{C}(t_1,t_2;r_1,r_2) = \mathcal{C}_0\,\delta_{x_1,x_2}\delta_{\gamma_1,\gamma_2}\,(t_1-t_2)^{-2x_1}\left(1 + \frac{\mu}{\gamma_1}\left|\gamma_1\frac{r_1-r_2}{t_1-t_2}\right|\right)^{-2\gamma_1/\mu} \tag{15}$$

[6] Interpretation: X_{-1}, Y_{-1} generate time- and space-translations, X_0 global dilatations $t \mapsto bt$, $r \mapsto br$, Y_0 rigid time-space rotations and X_1, Y_1 generate the 'special' conformal transformations.

[7] This concept of a dynamical symmetry, for the free diffusion equation, goes back to Jacobi (1842) and Lie (1881) and was re-introduced into physics by Niederer (1972) [31].

[8] See [40] for extensions as dynamical symmetries of the $(1+1)D$ Vlassov equation, isomorphic to $\mathfrak{conf}(2)$.

Table 1: Comparison of ortho- and two examples of meta-conformal invariance. Listed are the commutators of the Lie algebra bases $\langle X_n, Y_n\rangle_{n=\pm 1,0} \cong \mathfrak{conf}(2)$, the invariant Schrödinger operator $\mathcal{S}$ and the covariant two-point function $\mathscr{C}(t;r) = \langle\varphi(t,r)\varphi(0,0)\rangle$, up to normalisation. The physical nature of $\mathscr{C}$ is also indicated.
For ortho-conformal invariance and meta-conformal invariance 1, one has the constraints $x_1 = x_2$ and $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2$. For the meta-conformal invariance 2, we list only case A from the text. One has $\mu^{-1} = \mathrm{i}\nu$ with $\nu > 0$, and the constraints $\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 = \mu$ and $\gamma_1 - \gamma_2 = \mu(x_1 - x_2)$.

	ortho	meta-1	meta-2
Lie algebra $\mathfrak{conf}(2)$	$[X_n, X_m] = (n-m)X_{n+m}$ $[X_n, Y_m] = (n-m)Y_{n+m}$ $[Y_n, Y_m] = (n-m)X_{n+m}$	$[X_n, X_m] = (n-m)X_{n+m}$ $[X_n, Y_m] = (n-m)Y_{n+m}$ $[Y_n, Y_m] = \mu(n-m)Y_{n+m}$	$[X_n, X_m] = (n-m)X_{n+m}$ $[X_n, Y_m] = (n-m)Y_{n+m}$ $[Y_n, Y_m] = \mu(n-m)Y_{n+m}$
$\mathcal{S}$	$\partial_t^2 + \partial_r^2$	$-\mu\partial_t + \partial_r$	$-\mu\partial_t + \nabla_r$
$\mathscr{C}$	$(t^2+r^2)^{-x_1}$ correlator	$t^{-2x_1}\left(1 + \frac{\mu}{\gamma_1}\left\lvert\frac{\gamma_1 r}{t}\right\rvert\right)^{-2\gamma_1/\mu}$ correlator	$t^{1-x_1-x_2}\cdot\nu t\,(\nu^2t^2+r^2)^{-1}$ response (case A)

These well-known results are summarised in the first two columns of table 1. Comparing the two-point functions (13) and (15) shows that even for the same dynamical exponent $z = 1$, different forms of the scaling functions are possible for ortho- and meta-conformal invariance.

4. Are these examples of ortho- or meta-conformal invariance, which have $z = 1$ and are realised in terms of local first-order differential operators, suitable as a dynamical symmetry of the DLE in $1+1$ dimensions ? This must be answered in the negative, for the following reasons.

1. The DLE response function (8b) is distinct from the predictions (13,15), see also table 1. For the meta-conformal two-point function (15), the functional form is clearly different for finite values of the scaling variable $v = (r_1 - r_2)/(t_1 - t_2)$. The ortho-conformal two-point function (13) looks to be much closer, with the choice $x_1 = \frac{1}{2}$ and the scale factor fixed to $\nu = 1$, were it not for the extra factor $\nu(t-s)$. On the other hand, the two-time DLE correlator (8a) does not agree with (13) either, but might be similar to a two-point function computed in a semi-infinite space $t \geq 0$, $r \in \mathbb{R}$ with a boundary at $t = 0$.

2. The invariant equations $\mathcal{S}\varphi = 0$ are distinct from the deterministic part of the DLE Langevin equation (4). Recall the well-known fact [33] that for Langevin equations $\mathcal{S}\varphi = \eta$, where η is a white noise, and where the noise-less equation $\mathcal{S}\varphi_0 = 0$ has a local scale-invariance (including a generalised Galilei-invariance to derive Bargman super-selection rules [3]) all correlators and response functions can be reduced to responses found in the noise-less theory. In particular, the two-time response function of the full noisy equation $R(t,s;\boldsymbol{r}) = R_0(t,s;\boldsymbol{r})$, is identical to the response R_0 found when the noise is turned off and computed from the dynamical symmetry [33, 18].

   Indeed, in the example (7b,8b) of the DLE, one sees that the two-time response R is independent of T, which characterises the white noise.

We shall look for dynamical symmetries of the equation $\mathcal{S}\varphi = (-\mu\partial_t + \nabla_r)\,\varphi = 0$, which is the

deterministic part of the DLE Langevin equation (4), in 1+1 dimensions. We shall seek to derive the form of the two-time response function $R(t,s;\boldsymbol{r})$ from this dynamical symmetry. The two-time correlator C cannot be obtained in this way. Rather, we shall see that its 'deterministic' contribution $C_0(t,s;\boldsymbol{r})=0$ simply vanishes. As shown in [33], the correlator must be obtained from an integral over three-point response functions. We leave this for future work.

5. In direct space, the invariant Schrödinger operator for DLE should be $\mathcal{S}:=-\mu\partial_t+\nabla_r$, where ∇_r^α denotes the Riesz-Feller fractional derivative [37] of order α. For functions $f(r)$ of a single variable $r\in\mathbb{R}$ (assuming that $f(r)$ is such that the integral exists), we use the convention

$$\nabla_r^\alpha f(r):=\frac{\mathrm{i}^\alpha}{2\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\mathrm{d}k\mathrm{d}x\,|k|^\alpha\,e^{\mathrm{i}k(r-x)}\,f(x) \tag{16}$$

Then the following properties hold true, for formal manipulations [4],[18, app. J.2]

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_r^\alpha\nabla_r^\beta f(r)=\nabla_r^{\alpha+\beta}f(r)\quad&,\quad[\nabla_r^\alpha,r]\,f(r)=\alpha\partial_r\nabla_r^{\alpha-2}f(r)\ ,\ \nabla_r^\alpha f(\mu r)=|\mu|^\alpha\nabla_{\mu r}^\alpha f(\mu r)\\ \nabla_r^\alpha e^{\mathrm{i}qr}=(\mathrm{i}|q|)^\alpha\,e^{\mathrm{i}qr}\quad&,\quad\widehat{\left(\nabla_r^\alpha f(r)\right)}(q)=(\mathrm{i}|q|)^\alpha\,\widehat{f}(q)\ ,\ \nabla_r^2 f(r)=\partial_r^2 f(r)\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where $\widehat{f}(q)$ is the Fourier transform of $f(r)$. In selecting the generators for the Lie algebra of dynamical symmetries, we follow [17] and require that time translations $X_{-1}=-\partial_t$, dilatations $X_0=-t\partial_t-r\partial_r-x$ and space translations Y_{-1} are present. However, if one begins with the standard local generator $-\partial_r$ of spatial translations, it turns out that the *non-local* generator $-\nabla_r$ is generated as well [4],[18, ch. 5.3]. The closure of this set of generators, for generic values of $z\neq 2$, is still an open problem. In order to obtain a well-defined Lie algebra of dynamical symmetries of $\mathcal{S}$, we consider a *non-local* spatial translation operator $Y_{-1}=-\nabla_r$. Consider the following set of single-particle generators

$$\begin{aligned}X_{-1}&=-\partial_t\ ,\ X_0=-t\partial_t-r\partial_r-x\ ,\ X_1=-t^2\partial_t-2tr\partial_r-\mu r^2\nabla_r-2xt-2\gamma r\partial_r\nabla_r^{-1}\\ Y_{-1}&=-\nabla_r\ ,\ Y_0=-t\nabla_r-\mu r\partial_r-\gamma\ ,\ Y_1=-t^2\nabla_r-2\mu tr\partial_r-\mu^2r^2\nabla_r-2\gamma t-2\gamma\mu r\partial_r\nabla_r^{-1}\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

As in the set (14) of meta-conformal transformations, the constants x and γ, respectively, are the scaling dimension and rapidity of the scaling operator $\varphi=\varphi(t,r)$ on which these generators act. It is now an afternoon's exercise (before tea time) to check, with the help of (17),[9] the following commutator relations, for $n,m\in\{\pm1,0\}$

$$[X_n,X_m]=(n-m)X_{n+m}\ ,\ [X_n,Y_m]=(n-m)Y_{n+m}\ ,\ [Y_n,Y_m]=\mu(n-m)Y_{n+m} \tag{19}$$

This establishes the Lie algebra isomorphism $\langle X_n,Y_n\rangle_{n=\pm1,0}\cong\mathfrak{conf}(2)$. Furthermore, since

$$[\mathcal{S},Y_n]\,\varphi=[\mathcal{S},X_{-1}]\,\varphi=0\ ,\ [\mathcal{S},X_0]\,\varphi=-\mathcal{S}\varphi\ ,\ [\mathcal{S},X_1]\,\varphi=-2t\mathcal{S}\varphi+2(\mu x-\gamma)\varphi \tag{20}$$

the infinitesimal transformations (18) form a Lie algebra of meta-conformal dynamical symmetries (of the deterministic part) *of the* DLE *equation (4), if* $\gamma=x\mu$. In contrast to the generators (14), the generators (18) are non-local and do not generate simple local changes of the coordinates (t,r). In spite of an attempt to interpret non-local infinitesimal generators as the transformation of a distribution of coordinates [19], finding a clear geometrical interpretation of the generators (18) remains an open problem.

[9] Use the identities $\left[\nabla_r,r^2\right]=2r\partial_r\nabla_r^{-1}$, $\left[r^2\nabla_r,r\partial_r\right]=-r^2\nabla_r$ and $[\nabla_r,\partial_r]=\left[\partial_r\nabla_r^{-1},r\right]=0$.

6. We look for the covariant n-point functions. We expect [18] that these will correspond physically to response functions, i.e. the two-time response $R(t,s;r) = \langle \varphi(t,r)\widetilde{\varphi}(s,0)\rangle$, where $\widetilde{\varphi}$ is the response operator conjugate to the scaling operator φ, in the context of Janssen-de Dominicis theory [41]. In order to write down the n-body operators analogous to (18), we must ascribe a 'signature' $\varepsilon = \pm 1$ to each scaling operator. We choose the convention that $\varepsilon_i = +1$ for scaling operators φ_i and $\varepsilon_i = -1$ for response operators $\widetilde{\varphi}_i$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{-1} \;=\; Y_{-1}^{[n]} \;&=\; \sum_i \left[-\varepsilon_i \nabla_i\right] \quad , \qquad Y_0 \;=\; Y_0^{[n]} \;=\; \sum_i \left[-\varepsilon_i t_i \nabla_i - \mu r_i D_i - \gamma_i\right] \\
Y_1 \;=\; Y_1^{[n]} \;&=\; \sum_i \left[-\varepsilon_i t_i^2 \nabla_i - 2\mu t_i r_i D_i - \mu^2 \varepsilon_i r_i^2 \nabla_i - 2\gamma_i t_i - 2\mu\gamma_i \varepsilon_i r_i D_i \nabla_i^{-1}\right] \\
X_{-1} \;=\; X_{-1}^{[n]} \;&=\; \sum_i \left[-\partial_i\right] \qquad , \qquad X_0 \;=\; X_0^{[n]} \;=\; \sum_i \left[-t_i\partial_i - r_i D_i - x_i\right] \\
X_1 \;=\; X_1^{[n]} \;&=\; \sum_i \left[-t_i^2 \partial_i - 2t_i r_i D_i - \mu\varepsilon_i r_i^2 \nabla_i - 2x_i t_i - 2\gamma_i \varepsilon_i r_i D_i \nabla_i^{-1}\right]
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

with the short-hands $\partial_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial t_i}$, $D_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial r_i}$ and $\nabla_i = \nabla_{r_i}$. It can be checked that the generators (21) obey the meta-conformal Lie algebra (19). Now, for a $(n+m)$-point function

$$\mathscr{C}_{n,m} = \mathscr{C}_{n,m}(t_1,\ldots,t_{n+m};r_1,\ldots,r_{n+m}) = \langle \varphi_1(t_1,r_1)\cdots\varphi_n(t_n,r_n)\widetilde{\varphi}_{n+1}(t_{n+1},r_{n+1})\cdots\widetilde{\varphi}_{n+m}(t_{n+m},r_{n+m})\rangle$$

of quasi-primary scaling and response operators, the covariance is expressed through the projective Ward identities $X_k^{[n+m]}\mathscr{C}_{n,m} = Y_k^{[n+m]}\mathscr{C}_{n,m} = 0$, for $k = \pm 1, 0$.

7. We apply this to the two-time *response function* $\mathscr{R} = \mathscr{R}(t_1,t_2;r_1,r_2) = \mathscr{C}_{1,1}(t_1,t_2;r_1,r_2)$. From $X_{-1}\mathscr{R} = 0$ it follows that $\mathscr{R} = \mathscr{R}(t;r_1,r_2)$, with $t = t_1 - t_2$. On the other hand, the condition $Y_{-1}\mathscr{R} = 0$ would lead in Fourier space to $(\varepsilon_1|q_1| + \varepsilon_2|q_2|)\,\widehat{\mathscr{R}}(t;q_1,q_2) = 0$. Because of the assigned signatures $\varepsilon_1 = -\varepsilon_2 = 1$, this equation can have a non-vanishing solution such that we can write $\mathscr{R} = F(t,r)$, with $r = r_1 - r_2$. However, for a two-point *correlator* $\mathscr{C}_{2,0}$, with $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = 1$, the Ward identity $Y_{-1}\mathscr{C}_{2,0} = 0$ would simply imply that $\widehat{\mathscr{C}}_{2,0} = 0$, and in agreement with the fact that the DLE-correlator (7a,8a) vanishes as $T \to 0$. Standard calculations, see e.g. [18], lead to the following set of conditions for the function $\mathscr{R} = F(t,r)$

$$\left[-t\partial_t - r\partial_r - x_1 - x_2\right] F = 0 \tag{22a}$$

$$\left[-t\varepsilon_1\nabla_r - \mu r\partial_r - \gamma_1 - \gamma_2\right] F = 0 \tag{22b}$$

$$\left[-t^2\partial_t - 2tr\partial_r - \mu r^2\varepsilon_1\nabla_r - 2x_1 t - 2\gamma_1\varepsilon_1 r\partial_r\nabla_r^{-1}\right] F = 0 \tag{22c}$$

$$\left[-t^2\varepsilon_1\nabla_r - 2\mu tr\partial_r - \mu^2\varepsilon_1 r^2\nabla_r - 2\gamma_1 t - 2\mu\gamma_1\varepsilon_1 r\partial_r\nabla_r^{-1}\right] F = 0 \tag{22d}$$

Eqs. (22c,22d) can be further simplified by combining them with (22a,22b) and reduce to

$$(x_1 - x_2)\left(t + \mu\varepsilon_1 r\partial_r\nabla_r^{-1}\right) F = 0 \;\;,\;\; \left((\gamma_1 - \gamma_2) - \mu\,(x_1 - x_2)\right) tF = 0 \tag{23}$$

If F does not contain a factor $\sim \delta(t)$, the second eq. (23) gives the constraint $\gamma_1 - \gamma_2 = \mu(x_1 - x_2)$. Eq. (22a) implies the scaling form $F(t,r) = t^{-2x} f(v)$, with $v = r/t$ and $x = \frac{1}{2}(x_1 + x_2)$. From (22b,23), the scaling function $f(v)$ must satisfy, with $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)$

$$\left(\varepsilon_1\nabla_v + \mu v\partial_v + 2\gamma\right) f(v) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla_v^{-1}\left[(x_1 - x_2)\left(\varepsilon_1\nabla_v + \mu v\partial_v + \mu\right)\right] f(v) = 0 \tag{24}$$

The two conditions in eq. (24) are compatible in two distinct cases:

Case A: $2\gamma = \mu$. Then $(\varepsilon_1 \nabla_v + \mu v \partial_v + \mu) f(v) = 0$ and $x_1 \neq x_2$ is still possible.

Case B: $x_1 = x_2$. Then $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2$ and $(\varepsilon_1 \nabla_v + \mu v \partial_v + 2\gamma) f(v) = 0$.

In Fourier space, eq. (22b) gives $(\mathrm{i}\varepsilon_1 |q| - \mu q \partial_q + (2\gamma - \mu))\, \widehat{f}(q) = 0$, which illustrates the difference between cases A and B. It follows that $\widehat{f}(q) = \widehat{f}_0 q^{2\gamma/\mu - 1} \exp(\mathrm{i}\varepsilon_1 |q|/\mu)$, where $\widehat{f}_0$ is a normalisation constant. Finally, comparison of the Schrödinger operator $\mathcal{S} = -\mu\partial_t + \nabla_r$ with the DLE equation (4) shows that $\mu^{-1} = \mathrm{i}\nu$. Transforming back into direct space, we find

$$f(v) = f_0 \times \begin{cases} \varepsilon_1 \nu \left(\nu^2 + v^2\right)^{-1} & ; \text{ case A} \\ \mathrm{Re}\left(e^{-\mathrm{i}\pi\psi/2} \left(\varepsilon_1 \nu - \mathrm{i}v\right)^{-\psi - 1} \right) & ; \text{ case B, with } \psi + 1 := 2\mathrm{i}\nu\gamma \end{cases} \tag{25}$$

A linear combination of these two solutions is a solution of the linear system (24) as well.

8. In particular, for case A, the final form of the two-time response function $\mathscr{R}$ becomes, with a normalisation constant F_0 and $x = \frac{1}{2}(x_1 + x_2)$

$$\mathscr{R} = F(t,r) = F_0\, t^{1-2x} \frac{\varepsilon_1 \nu t}{\nu^2 t^2 + r^2} \quad ; \text{ with } t = t_1 - t_2,\ r = r_1 - r_2 \ \text{ (case A)} \tag{26}$$

If one takes $x = \frac{1}{2}$, and $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_+$, this *reproduces the exact solution (8b) of the response in* $(1+1)D$ DLE. This is our main result: *the non-local representation (21) of* $\mathfrak{conf}(2)$ *is necessary to reproduce the correct scaling behaviour of the non-stationary response.* The properties and predictions of this second example of a meta-conformal symmetry, for the special case A, are listed in the last column of table 1. An important difference is that ortho-conformal invariance and meta-conformal invariance 1 predict the form of a two-time correlator $\mathscr{C} = \mathscr{C}_{2,0}$, whereas the meta-conformal invariance 2 predicts the form of a two-time response $\mathscr{R} = \mathscr{C}_{1,1}$.

Summary: we have proposed a meta-conformal dynamical symmetry for the DLE in $1+1$ dimensions. This symmetry, isomorphic to the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R}) \oplus \mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$, is realised in terms of *non-local* generators, see eqs. (18,21). It is distinct from other known representations of the conformal Lie algebra, both in the form of the invariant Schrödinger operator $\mathcal{S}$ and in the predicted shape of the covariant two-point function, see table 1. In particular, the generator Y_{-1} which plays the role of 'spatial translations' is manifestly non-local. The full time-space form of the two-time response $R(t,s;r)$ in (8b) can be derived from this dynamical symmetry. This is the first time that (i) the full response (and not only the auto-response $R(t,s;0)$) can be confirmed and (ii) that the set of generators closes into a Lie algebra, for a system with $z \neq 2$.

In view of Spohn's mapping [38], which relates the $(1+1)D$ DLE equation (4) with the quantum chain (5) and the terrace-step-kink model, a convenient linear combination of the prediction of $R(t,s;r)$ from cases A and B might describe the non-stationary response of vicinal surfaces. Indeed, the explicit form of the connected *stationary* correlator $\langle \varrho(t,r)\varrho(t,0)\rangle_c$ of the particle density $\varrho(t,r) = \partial_r h(t,r)$, obtained by Karevksi and Schütz from (5) in the limit $\lambda \to \infty$ [25, eq.(1)], contains two terms which look quite analogous to the responses (25) in cases A and B. While that is distinct from the non-stationary responses considered here, the qualitative analogy is encouraging. Certainly, a precise test is called for. This will require to work out higher n-point functions in order to be able to derive the form of non-equilibrium correlators. Stationary correlators might be included by considering an appropriate initial condition. An obvious further extension will be to dimensions $d > 1$. Conceptually, the consideration of

manifestly non-local generators in local scale-invariance might lead to further insight for the construction of dynamical symmetries for different values of z.

Acknowledgements: I thank G.M. Schütz for fruitful discussions. This work was started at the workshop 'Advanced Conformal Field Theory and Applications' (ACFT) at the Institute Henri Poincaré Paris. It is a pleasure to thank the organisers for their warm hospitality. This work was also partly supported by the Collège Doctoral franco-allemand Nancy-Leipzig-Coventry (*'Statistical Physics of Complex Systems'*) of UFA-DFH.

References

[1] F.D.A. Aarão Reis and J. Stafiej, J. Phys. Cond. Matt. **19**, 065125 (2007) [cond-mat/0609428].

[2] A.L. Barabási, H.E. Stanley, *Fractal concepts in surface growth*, Cambridge University Press (1995).

[3] V. Bargman, Ann. of Math. **56**, 1 (1954).

[4] F. Baumann, thèse de doctorat/Dissertation, Nancy & Erlangen (2007).

[5] A.A. Belavin, A.M. Polyakov and A.B. Zamolodchikov, Nucl. Phys. **B241**, 333 (1984).

[6] L. Bertini, A. De Sole, D. Gabrielli, G. Jona-Lasinio, C. Landim, Rev. Mod. Phys. **87**, 593 (2015) [arXiv:1404.6466].

[7] Y.-L. Chou and M. Pleimling, J. Stat. Mech. P08007 (2010) [arXiv:1007.2380];
Y.-L. Chou and M. Pleimling, Physica **A391**, 3585 (2012) [arXiv:1112.5867].

[8] I. Corwin, Rand. Matrices Theory Appl. **1**, 1130001 (2012) [arXiv:1106.1596].

[9] G.L. Daquila and U.C. Täuber, Phys. Rev. **E83**, 051107 (2011) [arXiv:1102.2824].

[10] E. Darvish and A.A. Marsoudi, J. Math. Phys. **50**, 013304 (2009).

[11] S.F. Edwards and D.R. Wilkinson, Proc. Roy. Soc. **A381**, 17 (1982).

[12] F. Family and T. Vicsek, J. Phys. **A18**, L75 (1985).

[13] S.M. Garcia-Carranco, J. Bory-Reyes, A.S. Balankin, Physica **A452**, 60 (2016).

[14] T. Halpin-Healy and G. Palansantzas, Europhys. Lett. **105**, 50001 (2014) [arXiv:1403.7509].

[15] T. Halpin-Healy and K.A. Takeuchi, J. Stat. Phys. **160**, 794 (2015) [arXiv:1505.01910].

[16] L. Hedayatifar, A.A. Masoudi, M. Khorrami, M. Stastna and M. Kohandel, J. Phys. **A47**, 455003 (2014).

[17] M. Henkel, Nucl. Phys. **B641**, 405 (2002) [hep-th/0205256].

[18] M. Henkel and M. Pleimling, *"Non-equilibrium phase transitions vol. 2: ageing and dynamical scaling far from equilibrium"*, Springer (Heidelberg 2010).

[19] M. Henkel and S. Stoimenov, Nucl. Phys. **B847**, 612 (2011) [arXiv:1011.6315].

[20] M. Henkel, J.D. Noh and M. Pleimling, Phys. Rev. **E85**, 030102(R) (2012) [arXiv:1109.5022].

[21] M. Henkel and X. Durang, J. Stat. Mech, P05022 (2015) [arXiv:1501.07745].

[22] M. Henkel, Symmetry **7**, 2108 (2015) [arXiv:1509.03669].

[23] M. Henkel and S. Stoimenov, J. Phys. A, at press [arXiv:1607.00685].

[24] M. Kardar, G. Parisi and Y.-C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 889 (1986).

[25] D. Karevski and G.M. Schütz, [arXiv:1606.04248].

[26] J. Krug and P. Meakin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 703 (1991).

[27] J. Krug, in A. McKane, M. Droz, J. Vannimenus, D. Wolf (eds) *Scale invariance, interfaces and non-equilibrium dynamics*, NATO ASI Series vol. **B344**, Plenum Press (London 1994), p. 1.

[28] J. Krug, Adv. Phys. **46**, 139 (1997).

[29] M. Krech, Phys. Rev. **E55**, 668 (1997) [cond-mat/9609230]; erratum **E56**, 1285 (1997).

[30] J.F. Joanny and P.G. de Gennes, J. Chem. Phys. **81**, 552 (1984);
H. Gao and J.R. Rice, J. Appl. Mech. **56**, 828 (1989).

[31] U. Niederer, Helv. Phys. Acta, **45**, 802 (1972).

[32] G. Ódor, J. Kelling, S. Gemming, Phys. Rev. **E89**, 032146 (2014) [arXiv:1312.6029];
J. Kelling, G. Ódor, S. Gemming, Phys. Rev. **E94**, 022107 (2016)[arXiv:1605.02620];
J. Kelling, G. Ódor, S. Gemming, [arXiv:1609.05795].

[33] A. Picone and M. Henkel, Nucl. Phys **B688** 217, (2004) [arxiv:cond-mat/0402196].

[34] A.M. Polyakov, Sov. Phys. JETP Lett. **12**, 381 (1970).

[35] V. Popkov and G.M. Schütz, J. Stat. Phys. **142**, 627 (2011) [arXiv:1011.3913].

[36] A. Röthlein, F. Baumann and M. Pleimling, Phys. Rev. **E74**, 061604 (2006) [cond-mat/0609707]; erratum **E76**, 019901(E) (2007).

[37] S.G. Samko, A.A. Kilbas and O.I. Marichev, *Fractional integrals and derivatives*, Gordon and Breach (Amsterdam 1993).

[38] H. Spohn, Phys. Rev. **E60**, 6141 (1999) [arxiv:cond-mat/9908381].

[39] H. Spohn, J. Stat. Phys. **154**, 1191 (2014) [arXiv:1305.6412].

[40] S. Stoimenov and M. Henkel, Symmetry **7**, 1595 (2015) [arXiv:1509.00434].

[41] U.C. Täuber, *Critical dynamics: a field-theory approach to equilibrium and non-equilibrium scaling behavior*, Cambridge University Press (Cambridge 2014).

[42] K.A. Takeuchi and M. Sano, J. Stat. Phys. **147**, 853 (2012) [arXiv:1203.2530].

[43] K.A. Takeuchi, J. Stat. Mech. P01006 (2014) [arXiv:1310.0220].

[44] S.Y. Yoon and Y. Kim, Phys. Rev. **E68**, 036121 (2003).

[45] D.E. Wolf and J. Villain, Europhys. Lett. **13**, 389 (1990);
S. das Sarma and P. Tamborenea, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 325 (1991).

[46] A. Zoia, A. Rosso and M. Kardar, Phys. Rev. **E76**, 021116 (2007) [arXiv:0706.1254].